



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,129	01/14/2004	Steven J. Harrington	D/A3266 (1508/3930)	3814

7590 09/11/2007  
Gunnar G. Leinberg, Esq.  
Nixon Peabody LLP  
Clinton Square  
P.O. Box 31051  
Rochester, NY 14603-1051

EXAMINER
----------

ROGERS, SCOTT A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/11/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/757,129	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HARRINGTON, STEVEN J.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Scott A. Rogers	<b>Art Unit</b> 2625	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6, 11, 16, 21 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5, 7-10, 12-15, 17-20, 22-25 and 27-30 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/14/2004</u> | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Detailed Action</u>                   |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Maltz et al (US 5734802 A).

#### Referring to claims 1, 11, and 21:

Maltz et al disclose defining a finite set of document rendering intents (hue, saturation, and luminance of graphical and pictorial objects) as a basis for document rendering, expressing at least one desired document rendering strategy comprising a first combination of the document rendering intents (using a blend of look-up tables for color mapping), and associating the at least one desired document rendering strategy with at least one rendering decision associated with a document (decision based on whether image signal are outside the pictorial gamut). See abstract and col. 4, lines 37-67 and col. 5, lines 32-49.

Referring to claims 6, 16, and 26:

Maltz et al disclose identifying the finite set of document rendering intents (hue, saturation, and luminance of graphical and pictorial objects) at a rendering device, wherein a document rendering method is implemented by the rendering device for each of the document rendering intents (using one or a blend of the look-up tables for color mapping), and obtaining the associated desired document rendering strategy associated with the at least one rendering decision. See abstract and col. 4, lines 37-67 and col. 5, lines 32-49 (decision based on whether image signal are outside the pictorial gamut).

Claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Balasubramanian et al (US 6744534 B1).

Referring to claims 1, 11, and 21:

Balasubramanian et al disclose defining a finite set of document rendering intents as a basis for document rendering, expressing at least one desired document rendering strategy comprising a first combination of the document rendering intents (using a blend of color mapping transforms), and associating the at least one desired document rendering strategy with at least one rendering decision associated with a document (decision based on where a pixel is located in the device or pictorial gamut). See abstract and col. 3, line 66 to col. 4, line 21, and col. 6, line 56 to col. 7, line 40.

Referring to claims 6, 16, and 26:

Balasubramanian et al disclose identifying the finite set of document rendering intents at a rendering device, wherein a document rendering method is implemented by the rendering device for each of the document rendering intents (using one or a blend of the color mapping transforms), and obtaining the associated desired document rendering strategy associated with the at least one rendering decision (decision based on where a pixel is located in the device or pictorial gamut). See abstract and col. 3, line 66 to col. 4, line 21, and col. 6, line 56 to col. 7, line 40.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-15, 17-20, 22-25, and 27-30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Cited Art***

The art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott A Rogers whose telephone number is 571-272-7467. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday 8:00am-5:00pm.

Art Unit: 2625

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ed Coles can be reached at 571-272-7402.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to TC2600 Customer Service at 571-272-2600. Official correspondence by facsimile should be sent to 571-273-8300. The USPTO Customer Service Center phone number is 800-PTO(786)-9199 or 571-272-1000.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



SCOTT ROGERS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

03 September 2007